

REMARKS

Claims 63-101 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action dated March 11, 2009, claims 63-101 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative Jennifer Bush and Examiner McLean had a telephonic interview on April 8, 2009, during which the claims were discussed with respect to the Reese reference. The discussion is reflected in the arguments presented below. No agreement was reached, but the Examiner agreed to consider the arguments when submitted.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC §102(e)

In the 4th paragraph of the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 63-101 under 35 USC §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Reese et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,298,512 ("Reese"). This rejection is now traversed.

1. Previous Arguments with Respect to Reese Were Not Addressed

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that the arguments below with respect to Reese have been presented on three previous occasions: in Amendment A, filed May 22, 2008, in Amendment B/Response to Restriction Requirement, filed October 20, 2008, and in the Response to Non-compliant Amendment, filed November 25, 2008. Applicants note that

in the pending Final Office Action, the Examiner has not responded to these arguments. Applicants hereby request that the finality of the pending action be withdrawn on this ground.

2. Reese Does Not Anticipate the Pending Claims

Independent claims 63, 78, and 96 respectively recite a printer, method, and computer program product for printing time-based media. Claim 78 is representative:

In a printer with an embedded multimedia server, a method for printing time-based media content comprising:

performing multimedia content processing, comprising:
monitoring streaming media content from a time-based media source input to the printer;
selecting a portion of the streaming media content based on a plurality of user defined criteria;
indexing the selected portion of the streaming media content;
constructing a storable representation for the selected portion of the streaming media content; and
generating by the printer a printout of the storable representation.

These aspects of the invention are not disclosed by Reese. Reese discloses a printer with an embedded database driver to convert data input to a database compatible format. *See* Reese, col. 4, ll. 1-19. However, the embedded web server of Reese processes only *static* web pages; there is no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of monitoring **streaming media content**, selecting a portion of the **streaming media content**, or indexing the selected portion of the **streaming media content** as recited in claims 63, 78, and 96. This difference is not trivial. Monitoring, selecting, and indexing streaming media requires significantly more sophisticated processing than necessary for static media, making the claimed multimedia server functions more difficult, and making them less likely to be embedded in a printer device. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 78 are patentably distinguishable over Reese.

Claims 64-77, 79-95, and 97-101 variously depend from claims 63, 78, and 96, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited reference and which recite additional features not shown in the cited reference. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 64-77, 79-95, and 97-101 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

In addition, with respect to claims 72, 85, and 97, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of “receiving user input... **indicating a participant speaker**,” “segmenting” and “indexing” the streaming media content **based on the speaker** in the recorded video meeting, nor “selecting a media clip...illustrating a time period” **when the speaker is speaking** in the recorded video meeting. Thus claims 72, 85, and 97, and their dependent claims are further distinguishable over Reese for these additional reasons.

In addition, with respect to claims 64, 91, and 99, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of receiving a document in a print job, extracting a URL from the document, retrieving a web page identified by the referenced URL, constructing a printable representation of the web page, associating the printable representation of the web page with a thumbnail image, nor displaying the thumbnail image in an embedded printer display. Thus, claims 64, 91, and 99, and their dependent claims are further distinguishable over Reese for these additional reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 63-101 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: _April 20, 2009

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/
Attorneys for Assignee
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200